

### R E M A R K S

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

### SUPPORT FOR THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Support for the claim amendments and new claims may be found in the specification, for example, on page 4 line 16 thru page 5 line 12, page 7 lines 13-19, page 8 lines 2-13, page 9 lines 14-17, page 10 lines 8-14 and FIGS. 1 and 2 as originally filed. Thus, no new matter has been added.

### OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The objection to the drawings for non-plain and illegible numbers and reference characters has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to accept the substitute figures submitted herein.

### OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The objection to the specification for "system 50" has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, has been obviated in part by appropriate amendment, is

respectfully traversed in part and should be withdrawn.

Applicants' representative respectfully traverses the assertion that the use of the term "may" in the specification is unclear and renders the disclosure inadequate. Describing the invention using permissive language instead of mandatory language is a logical and appropriate method to inform those skilled in the art that variations to the disclosed embodiments may remain within the spirit and scope of the invention. The claims, which define the scope of the invention, do not use the term "may". As such, the objections to the specification should be withdrawn.

Regarding the attributes, the specification is written for one of ordinary skill in the art. In contrast, the Office Action simply states on page 3 that the attributes are "unclear" and "The specification is full with such deficiencies" without any evidence or explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art would not understand the specification. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to either (i) provide clear cites to specific pages/lines, evidence and a short explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to make and use the invention or (ii) withdraw the rejection.

#### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

The rejection of claims 1-9, 11-14 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by publication "A Built-In

Current Monitor for Testing Analog Circuit Blocks" by Tabatabaei et al. (hereafter Tabatabaei-1) has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

Tabatabaei-1 concerns a built-in current monitor for testing analog circuit blocks (Title). In contrast, claim 1 provides (in part) a step for generating one or more source signals by adding a digital signature to each of one or more analog signals. In contrast, Tabatabaei-1 appears to be silent regarding **adding** digital signatures to analog signals. Furthermore, the statement in section 1.3 of Tabatabaei-1 that "The BICI block generates a digital signature **proportional** to  $I_{dd}$ " (emphasis added) does not appear discuss **adding** the digital signature to  $I_{dd}$  or any other analog signal. Therefore, Tabatabaei-1 does not appear to disclose or suggest a step for generating one or more source signals by adding a digital signature to each of one or more analog signals as presently claimed. Claim 9 provides language similar to claim 1. As such, the claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 further provides a step for modeling an analog design using source signals having digital signatures in place of analog signals for verifying connectivity. In contrast, Tabatabaei-1 appears to be silent regarding use of the digital signatures in modeling a design. Therefore, Tabatabaei-1 does not appear to disclose or suggest a step for modeling an analog design

using source signals having digital signatures in place of analog signals for verifying connectivity as presently claimed. As such, claim 1 is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 further provides a step for verifying connectivity of an attributed signals from a source block to a destination block within a model of an analog device by verifying reception of unique digital signatures associated with each of the attributed signals at the destination block. In contrast, Tabatabaei-1 appears to be silent regarding both (i) verification of connectivity between blocks and (ii) verification for reception of digital signatures at a destination block. Therefore, Tabatabaei-1 does not appear to disclose or suggest a step for verifying connectivity of an attributed signals from a source block to a destination block within a model of an analog device by verifying reception of unique digital signatures associated with each of the attributed signals at the destination block as presently claimed. As such, claim 9 is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8 and 11 depend from either claim 1 or claim 9, which are now believed to be allowable. As such, claims 2-8 and 11 are fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 12-14 and 17-19 have been cancelled.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabatabaei-1 in view of publication "A Current Integrator for BIST of Mixed-Signals IC's" by Tabatabaei et al. (hereafter Tabatabaei-2) has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabatabaei-1 in view of publication "On Analog Signature Analysis" by Novak et al. has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabatabaei-1 in view of Tabatabaei-2 and publication "Pseudorandom Testing for Mixed-Signal Circuits" by Pan et al. has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 which is now believed to be allowable. As such, claim 10 is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 15 and 16 have been cancelled.


Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge our office Account No. 50-0541.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.



---

Christopher P. Maiorana  
Registration No. 42,829  
24840 Harper Avenue, Suite 100  
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080  
(586) 498-0670

Dated: June 30, 2004

Docket No.: 0325.00368